

**Canyons of the Ancients National Monument**  
**SWRAC Subgroup Meeting**  
**January 25, 2008**

**Subgroup Attendees**

Kelly Wilson	Chris Majors	Chuck MacAfee	Bill Lipe
Bob Clayton	Liz Tozer	Gerald Koppenhafer	Peter Ortego
Bud Poe			

**Bureau of Land Management Attendees**

LouAnn Jacobson, Monument Manager  
 Heather Musclow, Monument Planner  
 Linda Farnsworth, Monument Archaeologist

**Public Attendees**

Gala Pock, Citizen  
 Jennifer Bates, Questar  
 Mike Smith, Questar  
 Amber Clark, San Juan Citizen's Alliance  
 Leonard Maez, Questar  
 Ann Brown, Senator Salazar  
 Ann McCoy Harold, Senator Allard

**Agenda**

9:00am – 9:10am	Introductions
9:10am – 9:20am	Managers Update
<b><u>Recommendations to be Finalized</u></b>	
9:20am – 10:30am	Cultural Resources
10:30am – 10:40am	Break
10:40am – 11:30am	Other Formulated Recommendations
11:30am – 12:00pm	●Public Comment Period
12:00 pm – 1:00 pm	Lunch
1:00 pm – 2:30 pm	Other Formulated Recommendations
2:30pm – 3:00pm	●Public Comment Period

Kelly called the meeting to order at 9:10 am.  
 Committee member and members of the public introductions

**Manager's Update**

- LouAnn reminded everyone of the next SWRAC meeting, February 8<sup>th</sup> starting at 9:00 at the Dolores PLC.
- Monument Draft Plan Public comment closing date is January 30<sup>th</sup>, 2008.
- Sandstone Allotment Environmental Assessment (EA) should be coming out for public comment in early February.
- Kinder-Morgan EA will also be out shortly.
- Heather gave an update on comments received so far.
- Heather asked for comments regarding last meeting minutes.

**Cultural Resources**

Bill said the recommendations Heather sent out were a preliminary version and Bill/Mark met with Heather/Linda and revised them. What is before them today is the revised version. Everyone took some time to review Bill's hand-out.

Bill explained that they attempted to address the terms of community and landscape in the document. Good concepts but difficult to apply to the ground. It's clear the proclamation puts an emphasis on landscape management and the Monument is part of the National Landscape Conservation System. The plan should apply landscape in a general sense and more from a visual perspective. There has been quite a bit of interest for a large-scale approach to management from the beginning.

The objective is to increase the scale of planning for fluid mineral development. This is key for managing for cumulative effects. There seemed to be considerable support for the GADP process discussed at our last meeting.

Mark and Bill disagreed with the decision parameters. Bill thought they should stay in and Mark felt they should be replaced by objectives. Bill added #4 on the list of decision parameters.

Heather pointed out that the GADP memo has also been handed out to everyone today.

Bill said he's been at national meetings where they discussed avoidance of every individual site at a very high cost (School of Advanced Research, Santa Fe, July 2007). This may not necessarily be the best approach. Perhaps the best trade-off is to learn something from the resource, which could be at a lesser cost.

Kelly asked for clarification for what the group wanted to do. Did they want to look at each one of the recommendations, discuss, then agree or disagree or wait until the end. They agreed to working through recommendations one at a time. Bill said we can approve, disapprove or modify but we need written, official recommendations. Bud and Gerald suggested we do it item by item and cultural resources would be one item.

Bill asked Bob about his perspective on the GADP. Bob said he doesn't have experience with GADP but generally they (KM) support it. He feels like he should delve into it real closely word for word before voting on it.

Bill asked LouAnn for her perspective on GADP. LouAnn said it goes beyond visual issues and into the dense, continuous distributions of cultural resources as the need for managing at the GADP level.

Linda said the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) has provided comments and concerns regarding potential cultural districts on the Monument. They expect us to protect potential districts.

Bill asked unless you know where all the potential districts are, how can you manage for them? He said the Sand Canyon National Register District nomination took about 9 years to be listed.

Bob said he assumed what was being talked about is imposing No Surface Occupancy Districts.

LouAnn clarified that we cannot apply additional stipulations on existing leases (we can apply Conditions of Approval & Best Management Practices but not stipulations). However, we need to look at cumulative impacts, which is required by law and expected at the national level. We have obligations for valid existing rights in addition to obligations for the resources.

Bob said an obligation to the resource comes after valid existing rights. LouAnn said not necessarily, one right does not preclude us from meeting our environmental obligations. Bill reread the proclamation which states, we must manage for valid existing rights so as not to create any new impacts that interfere with the proper care and management of the objects protected by this proclamation. LouAnn said we have regulations that tell us what we are required to do.

Bill said think of the Historic Durango district with its historic buildings. It doesn't mean the only thing in the district comes from that period, but other architecture can not predominate. Bill said this can apply to cultural resources on the Monument. While some development can occur, it should not dominate areas that could qualify as a cultural district. LouAnn said what qualifies an area as a district is also very restrictive.

Kelly said the timeline is what concerns him. He's not against planning but thinks we have reached a point where planning has become a detriment to other facets mentioned in the plan such as oil and gas development. At this point things have stopped because of the plan and we need to move them forward. If we aren't careful, the APDs are taking up to 1-2 years to complete. That has to be sped up so that it is less than a year. Kelly said we have an opportunity to set up a management program here that is not at the expense of other things. If we suggest to the SWRAC that we do GADP it would take at least 5 years to implement.

Linda reiterated that the GADP process comes in before APDs and would be used to streamline the process. LouAnn said what it does is call for more up front planning, up to 5 years, so that the conflicts and issues can be worked through before an APD is submitted.

Gerald asked if there has been any master drilling plan for the Monument. The answer was no.

Bob said that most APDs only consist of a couple wells. We have gone to a larger scale recently. LouAnn gave the example of Goodman Point which went from 2 to 4 to 7 wells. This is clearly a different program than what we were receiving (i.e., minimal APDs and development), especially from the cumulative effects perspective.

Bill asked if the GADP could be updated. Bob asked if the GADP lives the life of the Plan. LouAnn said no, it would cover about 5 years of planning and continually be updated.

Peter/Chuck asked if there would be a NEPA analysis tied to each change in the GADP. LouAnn clarified that NEPA is only attached to individual APDs. The GADP would need to be continually updated. LouAnn reiterated that the objective was to deal with more of the problems up front so that we can avoid sensitive areas or minimize issues.

Kelly said we discussed the GADP 10 years ago. Why wasn't it developed then? Now it seems like we are in a crunch and the BLM can shut things down to wait for the Plan.

Chuck asked who completes the GADP. LouAnn said it starts with the developer, working with the agency. You can also include areas that are planned for plug and abandonment.

Kelly said another of his concerns was that once the developers are done with a road and archaeologists clear them for closure that they are closed instead of keeping them open for recreation. Bob said many are being left open for recreation.

Bob mentioned again the line in the proclamation that recognizes valid existing rights. Peter said the Tribe likes that line too.

Chuck asked if the archaeologists do not like the concept of "community." Bill said it was just that Mark and others have been defining "communities" in this area very specifically. Bill described how Mark applied the "cultural community concept" which contains arbitrary boundaries of 7 km. But this may not be a workable expression on the ground. Chuck then asked if that includes people who were there at the same time? Bill said yes. It differs from time period to time period. Some time periods stayed in one area for an expanded time period while others traveled through.

Chuck then asked if you remove the concept of community from a working document, then you would need to replace it with something else. What would that be? Bill said that is what they have described at the end of their recommendations. Chuck restated his question, asking if you give up the community concept, what do you give up from cultural preservation. Bill said a community is drawn from sites on the ground, so you can always have that. You can call them communities, zones of interaction, or high concentration areas. Linda answered Chuck's question by saying community would be replaced with the physical distribution and density of cultural resources on the land.

Chuck then stated what he thought he heard and that was if you construct a community like what Bill has described, you would draw a 14 km area and have no development within it. On the other hand, if you set the concept of community aside, you could then allow development right? Bill said the 14 km is an arbitrary no development zone. Bud said it sounds like the community definition is currently vogue in the archaeologist circle but is not the best for applying in a management plan.

Chris asked how long it would take to complete a GADP for one of these areas. Bob answered by saying however long it would take Kinder-Morgan to do a 5-year plan. Chris then asked if there is enough benefit from doing a GADP to offset doing analyses on individual APDs. Bob said there could be. He then asked how the information gets gathered that is needed for GADP...would it be up to the developer to do the surveys.

LouAnn said yes, you are developing your right. It depends on how much work has been done in the area in the past. We aren't talking thousands of acres of survey. It would require a Class III just because of the high density of sites. In areas where there is low density or no sites at all, will be where development is targeted.

Bob clarified that 40 acre surveys were for APDs not at the GADP level.

Chris then asked how long it takes for Kinder Morgan (KM) to plan where they want to put their wells. Bob said they do a yearly plan and submit it to the BLM. The CO2 is a continuous formation so anywhere we poke a hole we can find CO2. Oil & gas development depends on individual algal mounds

Bill pointed out that the GADP comes from a 2003 memo. It's not something that was just developed for this plan right now.

Bob asked how the boundary is defined for a GADP. LouAnn/Linda answered saying it depends on your plan of development. Jointly we define the GADP based on access needs, number of wells, etc.

Kelly said even if Bob comes in with a GADP, then that still doesn't mean we will make a decision to allow them to develop. In continuously dense sites the plan says the ADP will not be accepted or appropriate mitigation measures will be applied.

Kelly said the area has a high density of sites everywhere. Bill answered saying there is a high density of sites...which is why this is a National Monument. Bill is still unclear as to when/how the Class III survey will take place.

Bob said this is one of their concerns as well, we typically apply a Class III at the APD level not up front on a GADP scale.

Bill said in the long run, we can piece things together and deal with issues on a piece by piece basis or we can do some planning and deal with a larger area and ensure more efficiency and greater public benefit in meeting goals of protecting our resources.

Linda gave an analogy comparing a GADP with allotment management plans for livestock grazing permittees. We look at the whole allotment and base the analysis on existing information. It's a rough analogy but it is similar.

Bill asked when and how do the Class III surveys kick in and Linda answered saying when a GADP area has been established.

Bob said that was outrageous and unacceptable by them. We should not do this in areas we don't plan to disturb.

Linda/LouAnn pointed out that it is done so we don't have to keep moving well locations and be in the situation we are in now.

LouAnn then emphasized that this was a national initiative and Linda said the Colorado O&G Commission is using this process to protect wildlife habitat and fragmentation.

Bill said the only alternative was to go to a predictive model, which is quite costly. They are used as large scale planning tools. Bob said that is how Shell came into this process. It seems to be good information.

Chuck asked if there was a way to look at this topographically rather than geographic areas. LouAnn said absolutely. There would be no reason to survey areas such as cliff faces.

Kelly asked why we don't use the grazing allotments surveys to cover the needs for oil and gas development. Use these areas for our GADP. Bill answered saying if cows built roads and put in drilling pads then we could use the same areas, but we are talking different uses and that equates to different areas.

Bud said time delays are another issue. If we had the information up front, then it would be much more efficient down the road for processing development.

Chris asked if the Monument was not here, would the process we've been using satisfactorily protect cultural resources. LouAnn said that we were not addressing cumulative impacts. This is required by law. Bill then asked, given the changes and policies, is the cumulative effects analysis now necessary? LouAnn said yes. If other areas are applying this process such as Wyoming, Colorado Plateau, etc. why would I not apply this to a National Monument. This is not a requirement just because we are a Monument.

Chris asked if we really needed to recreate the wheel. If these are applied elsewhere, then do we even need to discuss it here? Is this to be applied whether we have a Monument or not? Bill agreed saying it isn't something special to the Monument. Chuck then said it sounded like to omit it would be special.

### **Break**

Bud made a motion that we recommend to the SWRAC that we adopt Bill and Mark's recommendations. Chuck seconded the motion.

Peter asked This description of "densely concentrated and continuous sites" seems ambiguous. Is this measurable in the field of cultural resources? Chris asked if Bill and Mark's recommendations were neutral, more workable, or less workable, than what was originally written?

Bill said this addresses the concern with "community" that was expressed at our last meeting...same for concerns with landscape. Densely concentrated and continuous has a standard definition in the archaeological field. These are pretty much used through-out the CRM field.

Bob said in an attempt to get rid of the word community, and given that APDs could be approved with mitigation measures and not just denied, he would agree with the recommendation.

Gerald asked if the GADP would require Class III inventory even if other inventory has already been done. LouAnn/Linda said yes, it would be a combination. We've discovered it is actually easier to resurvey especially when old survey is up to 30 years old and not accurate.

Chuck said it makes sense to move forward with the GADP process since it is established in BLM and in other states. Peter said he didn't think the SWRAC would override use of the GADP process anyway.

Bob then asked if KM came in with one well in Sand Canyon and one in Hovenweep, would that be one large GADP? Linda said we could look at these as separate units for

survey. LouAnn said if it is truly a single well we can look at it outside a GADP. However, if KM comes in the next year with another one in the area then we will know a GADP should have been done.

LouAnn said the Subgroup can submit comments to us through the SWRAC but they could not send them to us directly. Comments can be sent to us, however, from you as individuals.

Vote: All In Favor, except Bob and Gerald who did not vote. Kelly voted No.

### **Other Formulated Recommendations**

Bud summarized his comments which he had already given to Heather. Mexican spotted owl, lizards, cultural resources and other resources needing protection....this could close the Monument. However, Heather had explained that T&E species have not been located in the Monument. We do have suitable habitat so someday they may be present.

Bob reminded us that he had asked LouAnn about this same question using Sand Canyon as an example. Would recreation be stopped? And the answer was yes. But it's very unlikely that all these restrictions would occur in the same location at the same time.

Bob questioned our ban on the use of solar power. We need to change the wording in the Draft Plan since we want it used on well pads and other ways.

Bob said he had a question about the 16 foot right-of- way for roads. Heather said it was something being discussed and we plan to work with Gerald and the county.

### **Public Comment**

Mike Smith: Discussions among themselves on GADP. As designed its fine. The IM is written as a BMP so it may not be required. Exploratory well doesn't apply and IM mentions this. In theory it is good for efficiencies. In the draft plan, two Class III surveys are mentioned at the GADP level and at the APD level. This would diminish efficiency. They were glad mitigation measures were mentioned in Dr. Lipe's rewrite. The old version didn't mention mitigation measures and would indicate predetermination. There would be some real problems from industry on this. The mentioning of a 5-year plan would be difficult for them to do. They typically have to do exploratory wells that will ultimately determine where they go next. Year by year is doable but 5-year plan is not. Unlike CO2, they do not have the flexibility to move a site from one location to another since they are tied to algal mounds.

Amber Clark: There is a lot in this plan that is good. It is disheartening to hear this Committee say only negative things. She has sat through all our meetings, and she sees a lot of what this Committee has come up with in this plan. She thinks we could have gone farther with our protection of resources but was at least pleased to see we voted this in. She mentioned that San Juan Citizen's Alliance is not comfortable with the definition of a road in this plan.

Ann Brown: The Senator had a concern from the County Commission that the CANM Advisory Committee's work was not included in the plan. The Senator took that concern to Mark Stiles and LouAnn and got considerable information from them. Senator Salazar thinks the Monument is the best thing to hit this area in a long time.

### **Other Formulated Recommendations**

Chris had two issues and didn't feel he could draft them up like Bill did. The crux of the problem is not in the alternative but in the presentation. When you consider that agriculture is a historic use of this area, the plan portrays it as a negative. Grazing is a part of the local history and should continue. There have been a lot of changes since the early days.

Chris' recommendation is to "adjust the tone of this topic through-out the document to recognize the importance of grazing in the county".

It is unnecessary to bring up stubble height standards or utilization standards in this plan rather than the Allotment Management Plan.

Heather asked Chris if he had talked with Mike Jensen. Chris said he talked with Mike before the last meeting about changing the wording of the guidelines. But now he doesn't want to see that in this plan either. Instead, he said the Plan should focus on how we are going to monitor and what we want the Monument to look like. Everything else, i.e. utilization, stubble height, adjustments in grazing, should be in the AMP not in this plan.

Gerald said he thought a lot of the concern is that management of grazing allotments inside the monument would not be the same as those outside the monument. The San Juan Plan may not read the same as this and we need to be consistent.

Gerald said the same should occur with drilling. It should be managed the same inside the Monument as it is outside. We need to work this stuff out so that things can be done in a timely manner.

LouAnn pointed out that the San Juan plan deals with both BLM and USFS regulations.

Chris said he was not as concerned about consistency as he was an opportunity to improve...why not plan on how to use those rules and regulations to make a more workable situation. Alternative 1 is existing laws and regulations. LouAnn interjected that it was also the 1985 San Juan/San Miguel Plan which is what we are updating in this plan.

LouAnn said what we have attempted to do is show our objectives, what we want to accomplish, and the columns underneath are how we hope to get there.

Chris said looking at the objectives, there isn't one objective stating that we want to maintain the cultural, historical use of livestock grazing in the county.

Heather said the BLM manages the resources and that is our focus. One of the reasons we do this is to sustain the ability to graze and maintain this use.



Bob asked why we wouldn't allow supplemental feeding. Heather clarified that this is referring to the feedlot situation where you run out of feed and take bales of hay out and feed your livestock. Having an area becomes denuded and looking like a feedlot is not the intent of the BLM.

### **Lunch**

Chris continued the discussion on grazing by asking Gerald to share what Chris feels is a good point. Gerald said his point does not necessarily pertain to just this plan...but USFS and BLM regulations, the details of how to graze. As a person running cattle in pastures, the most important thing is the length of time you are staying on the pasture. It's never brought into consideration in these plans. Being on a pasture for only two weeks rather than 45 days makes the difference.

Heather said she thought this was simplifying a much more complex situation. Allotments are different sizes, operators run different numbers of livestock, there are a variety of species of vegetation in each allotment, different seasons, etc. Two weeks on a 5 acre allotment may be too much time whereas 45 days on a 1000 acre pasture may not be enough.

Chris said it is because of this variation that the details of stubble height or utilization levels should be listed in the AMP rather than Management Plan. LouAnn said there are a lot of things beside stubble height that goes into grazing management. Heather said these are guidelines with the detailed description of how they are applied in the individual Allotment Management Plans.

Chuck asked Gerald if he was proposing a change to what's in the plan. Gerald said no, he was not proposing a change. He said his point was that you can take 50 people out and come up with 50 different views on what % utilization is reached.

Chuck suggested that Gerald and Chris bring these thoughts together in a conversation with their constituents and see if change or at least understanding can come out of these discussions that way.

LouAnn: Another point is that many of the permittees won't/can't move their livestock every 2 weeks. Al/Gerald said they can do it. That is livestock management.

Chris made the motion to add a goal statement: To ensure continued viability of livestock grazing in the Monument in recognition of its importance in local history and culture and the regional economy.

Vote: All voted yes.

Chris' second recommendation was on page 106 at the bottom: Remove the word "major" in the Preferred Alternative.

Also on page 106 at the top, Preferred Alternative...remember to include emergency situations where cattle can be fed until they are able to be removed from the allotment. Snow is an example.

Chris also recommended that the preferred alternative read like Alternatives 3 and 4 with “and there are benefits to rangeland health” added to it (Page 106 top).

Vote: All voted in favor.

**Tribal Issues**

Peter made the suggestion that page 21 should be written the other way around...the last sentence is backwards. Our regulations must adhere to Brunot agreement not the other way around.

Bill asked how the regulations diminish treaty rights. Peter said they are concerned about restrictions on firearms, transportation, takings, and don't want any language in the plan that would limit tribal uses.

Bud clarified that the Brunot only refers to hunting rights. The last sentence talks about other resources.

Bill asked if Peter was saying there are no regulations the BLM can enforce against the tribe. Peter said not, only the Brunot agreement, which says they can hunt for subsistence purposes or other traditional uses. Bud then asked if the Brunot goes beyond hunting? Peter said it did not, only hunting and traditional gathering. But there are firearm issues...LouAnn pointed out that the firearm issue only refers to recreational shooting and not hunting. It was decided that Peter would work with Heather to make sure hunting and recreational shooting issues are both covered and clear.

Peter said on page 551 we mention the need but we don't spell it out on how. There can be specifics added like improvements on communications such as bringing us to the table with the Brunot commission. When white folks came into the area some treated the Native Americans positively while others did not. He's seen some white folks talking the Ute language to Ute people.

Peter said they support rights of private landowners, grazing, and others that used the land historically. What was going on before that brought us to the point of needing fixed now? Cumulative affects is understandable. Honest open communication is a key.

Bill brought us back to page 21, and asked Peter if how the statement is worded could cause trouble. Peter said the way it is worded sounds like a threat. We can reword to be more conciliatory. We need to work together to see the purposes of both the Proclamation and the Treaty are met.

LouAnn said the statement was probably concern for the issue off-road travel. Travel is restricted to existing roads. The treaty does not say we can destroy the land.

Chuck pointed out that the previous meeting minutes were very negative. Yet today we have had some good discussions and so far we have found common ground. He would like this committee to make a formal comment to the SWRAC expressing appreciation for the work the BLM has done, recognizing the process the BLM has taken.

Bill seconded that motion.

Bob feels the proof of pudding will come out in the final plan. Chuck feel regardless of the final plan, he thinks the process has been positive.

Vote: All voted yes, except Bob who did not vote.

**Fluid Minerals**

Bob said he hated to think it was intentional, maybe it was oversight, but some of the things in the plan look like it's geared towards driving oil and gas development off the Monument. Recognizing valid existing rights were not adequately addressed in the plan and should have been listed on page 7 in the purpose and need and in the vision on page 22. Something that has not been brought up and is of great concern is that the document does not project a reasonable foreseeable future for existing leases. Existing leases are left out of this EIS.

Heather explained that the decision to lease already existing leased lands is not within the decision parameter of this plan. That decision has already been made. However this use must be considered in cumulative effects.

Bill clarified that the proposed federal action is the management of the Monument, not whether we lease or not--right? Heather said we looked at unleased lands and evaluated whether to lease 800 to 24,400 acres because that is a decision to be made within this plan.

Bob said the other concern he has is the Class III survey at two stages ADP and GADP. Chuck asked how this is handled outside of the Monument? LouAnn said she wasn't sure where the two Class III requirements came from. She would think that one survey at the GADP stage would be sufficient. Bill thinks the Subgroup should decide when and how many stages of Class III survey occurs and make a recommendation on it.

LouAnn said the Subgroup can submit this as a comment if you like. However, doing it just at the ADP level would bring us back to where we are now. You would still be moving your development around to avoid sites so we would be managing it piece by piece like we are at this point.

Bill said our choices are either we go with existing survey information (often inadequate), a predictive model or new survey information at the GADP stage. Then Bill asked LouAnn if she could build in more flexibility by gathering information at the GADP level using existing information and/or require additional survey. LouAnn said we could look at this.

Bob said they do welcome the GADP Process.

Gerald asked how long it takes to do a Class III survey? How long would 40 acres take for example? LouAnn estimated one person under normal circumstances could do 40 acres in one day. The more sites, or the more complex or large the sites, the more time it will take. It can take one day to record one large site. Bill said a site in itself could cover 2 acres...the time is not in walking it is in recording. Chris asked what the typical cost for a BLM survey like this would be. LouAnn said an average cost in the Monument because of the site density is \$60-\$75/acre. Chris tallied the cost of a 40 acre survey if it were \$100/acre as \$4,000. Then you would be done with it for the long-term? Would that not be advantageous?

Bill pointed out that the GADP would cover a lot larger area. Chris then asked if clearance would cover a larger area for a long time wouldn't that be cost effective for

you? Bud pointed out that by having the long-range picture, you'll know better where you can go for development and not delay production.

Chris then asked of the total acres in the Monument, how many acres would be suitable for drilling for KM, regardless of cultural resources. Bob said he had no idea. Bill reiterated that the point is to look at larger areas over a longer time period. Given the future and our increased need for oil and gas, I think we need to look at larger areas for the future.

Chris said he can see the benefits of large scale planning and general agreement from everyone else here, with resistance from Bob. Would there be benefits to do a cost: share agreement between agency and industry to just do this analysis at a large scale and be done with it? LouAnn/Bill both stated that the BLM budget won't allow us to do this. Kelly said by the time the oil company buys the lease, does geophysical testing, then the GADP, then an APD, it's cost them a fortune.

LouAnn asked Bob what percent of the total cost of developing a location is the archaeological survey? Bob said it would be a very low percent because development is costly. Chuck said this was the cost of doing business.

Heather said perhaps the more efficient way of doing business would be to have the developers join forces and share costs to have the GADP completed. For example, Questar and KM shouldn't duplicate efforts.

Bob also made a recommendation that regarding the section on climate change impact, the plan should mention that KM injects CO<sub>2</sub> into the ground and not into the atmosphere.

Bob had a concern for managing the Monument at a VRM Class II level. Board of appeals suggests we place leased lands into a VRM Class III. Federal lands should be managed to promote and develop resources. This should be placed in the document. The more restrictions placed on oil and gas the less money goes to the county. As far as any official comment statements, they will come from the oil and gas companies with a copy given to the SWRAC directly.

Gerald mentioned that Montezuma County revenue from fluid mineral is over 40%. They pay taxes on both what they pull out and what they leave in the ground. Kelly said it's been as high as 60%.

Chuck pointed out that it is a nonrenewable resource, what happens when it runs out?

Gerald said the percent reliance on this income has dropped tremendously before. It can have a major impact. Chris said it would impact Dolores County as much if not more than Montezuma County. Gerald said that may be true but the difference is 2,500 people versus 25,000.

Kelly asked the Subgroup if there were other particular recommendations to be carried to SWRAC?

Chuck suggested the road definition be talked about today.

**Public Comment:**

Amber Clark: The definition of a road in this plan does not stand up legally.

Bill asked what was not legal about it.

Amber said you can interpret it to say that a cow or deer path could be a road, which has scary implications. A road is a constructed maintained route.

LouAnn said we are going to change the definition of a road. BLM has now defined roads and trails. We will be using the definitions in an Instruction Memo that came out last October.

Chuck felt it should be pointed out that the BLM made a good faith effort to allow people like him to continue mountain biking in Sand Canyon. Thank you for that. Hopefully, by changing the definition we can still allow this use.

Liz asked if the new road definition would do away with mountain biking in Sand Canyon.

Chris then asked if we make an exception for mountain biking in Sand Canyon, why not ATVs and Motorcycles.

LouAnn explained that the Sand Canyon area was closed to motorized use in the 1985 San Juan/San Miguel plan. At that point, mountain bikes were certainly not on the radar. In 1987 the BLM did an EA that designated the trail with authorized use by mountain bikes. There is a history in this area and we are trying to honor previous decisions. Since then, the East Rock trail has become a user-created bike trail. The BLM feels we are still protecting the objects of the Monument while allowing mountain biking. Where LouAnn struggles is that hiking and horseback riding are not restricted yet they can cause as much damage.

Chris asked if we were only talking these two areas or Monument-wide?

LouAnn said these two areas only. Our transportation map identifies every road in the Monument. In which, a cow path could not be a road unless we identify it as such. The concern is that another area outside of the Monument could take our definition and extrapolate it to mean something more.

Chris suggested on page 121 concerning "permit access to private landowners"...that the wording be changed to "provide *adequate* access..."

LouAnn said she suspects there will be another appendix showing how access to private land will be provided and the process.

Amber Clark: The SJCA is not against mountain biking on the Sand Canyon trail, but using the road definition in the plan is of concern. Amber suggested the Subgroup make a recommendation to the SWRAC that supports continued use of mountain bikes in this area.

Motion: This Subgroup supports continued use of mountain bikes as designated on the draft transportation plan.

Chris suggested we do not endorse the redefinition of roads in the draft plan in an effort to serve mountain bike use of the Sand Canyon and East Rock trails, however, we would endorse an exception in the plan to allow this use in those trails.

Vote: All voted Yes.

Al Heaton: Al had a stocking rate question. Is it a guideline or a maximum number? Should it be adjusted based on what is the actual total? He said the total AUMs we are showing in the Plan are different than what the actual total is. This is being caused by the purchase of some inholdings and other factors.

Kelly asked for any other comments.

LouAnn said the BLM did complete a land exchange in which we acquired 1,080 acres and it is now in the Lower McElmo Allotment. This is what Al was alluding to in his comment.

Kelly summarized his memo, the one he sent out to everyone earlier in the week and that was handed out here today. He realized that some of the things we are talking about today is what we talked about 10 years ago. We know that there is constant change. CANM has the opportunity to be the shining star of all multi-use property. He thinks we have had climate change going on in the area for a long time. At what stage were the Anasazi when they left and how do they compare with where we are today? After looking through the Plan, he didn't see what he was looking for to prepare us for change. He said he saw and felt the negativism that was brought out today and in our last meeting. We can't do this or can't do that. It needs to switch and be positive through working together. He felt that a lot of the plan was to maintain the status quo.

Bill felt the overall vision statement on Page 22 was lacking content to cover some of the forward looking issues. He felt it should express the hopes for the management of the area and to handle change in the future.

Process clarification: Heather will send out the motions electronically to everyone and Kelly will make the presentation at the SWRAC meeting. If there are edits needed, individuals will need to contact Kelly.

Chuck asked for an update on the status of the group.

LouAnn said the group will continue to operate as a Subgroup under the SWRAC. We can get together with you when we have a sorted analysis of comments or we can email you. Our response to comments will be part of the public record. The group felt an e-mail with the comment analysis and response would be fine.

Chuck felt it would be interesting him to get a high level understanding of comments.

LouAnn said we can provide the entire analysis of comments to the Subgroup.

Meeting Adjourned at 2:55 pm.